

## **REMARKS**

Claim 2 has been rewritten in independent form and is otherwise the same claim 2 as was originally presented.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Topff *et al.* (U.S. Patent 6,026,500).

Applicants respectfully traverse the § 102 rejections with the following arguments.

### 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

The Examiner rejected claims 1-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Topff *et al.* (U.S. Patent 6,026,500).

Since claims 1, 3-4, 7-9, and 13-16, the rejection of claims 1, 3-4, 7-9, and 13-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is moot.

### Claim 2

Applicants respectfully contend that Topff does not anticipate claim 2, because Topff does not teach each and every feature of claim 2.

Aa a first example of why Topff does not anticipate claim 2, Applicants respectfully contend that it is logically impossible for Topff to teach claim 2. Step 610 of Topff, FIG. 2A corresponds to the claimed step of “awaiting an occurrence of a trigger event associated with a system resource”, and the trigger event in claim 2 includes opening a trouble ticket. Therefore as applied to claim 2, step 610 of Topff, FIG. 2A comprises awaiting an occurrence of a trouble ticket. However, the trouble ticket is generated in step 700 of Topff, FIG. 2A in response to the trigger event (i.e., trouble ticket) being detected in step 612 and receipt of a trouble ticket command in step 614. Thus, the trouble ticket for the trigger event, being generated in step 700, does not exist when step 610 is performed. Accordingly, it is logically impossible for the method of FIG. 2A of Topff to perform the method of claim 2.

As a second example of why Topff does not anticipate claim 2, Topff does not teach the feature: “activating a prearranged user account that enables a service provider to access the system resource”.

The Examiner argues that Topff teaches the preceding feature of claim 2 in Topff, col. 4, lines 35-45.

In response, Applicants respectfully contend that Topff, col. 4, lines 35-45 does not teach the preceding feature of claim 2. In particular, Topff, col. 4, lines 35-45 does not teach a prearranged user account and makes no mention of a service provider.

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully maintain that Topff does not anticipate claim 2, and that claim 2 is in condition for allowance.

### Claims 5-6 and 10-12

Applicants respectfully contend that Topff does not anticipate claim 5, because Topff does not teach each and every feature of claim 5.

As a first example of why Topff does not anticipate claim 2, Topff does not teach the feature: “wherein the trigger event denotes that the system resource has a problem that needs attention of a service provider”.

As a second example of why Topff does not anticipate claim 2, Topff does not teach the feature: “in automatic response to the occurrence of the trigger event, activating a prearranged user account that authenticates the service provider to access the system resource to enable the service provider to provide one or more services relating to the system resource, wherein prior to the prearranged user account being activated the prearranged user account is in dormancy such that use of the prearranged user account is blocked”.

As a third example of why Topff does not anticipate claim 2, Topff does not teach the feature: “in automatic response to the occurrence of the closure event, deactivating the prearranged user account to dormancy such that use of the prearranged user account is blocked”.

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully maintain that Topff does not anticipate claim 5, and that claim 5 is in condition for allowance. Since claims 6 and 10-12 depend from claim 5, Applicants contend that claims 6 and 10-12 are likewise in condition for allowance.

### CONCLUSION

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully believe that all pending claims and the entire application meet the acceptance criteria for allowance and therefore request favorable action. If the Examiner believes that anything further would be helpful to place the application in better condition for allowance, Applicants invites the Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below. The Director is hereby authorized to charge and/or credit Deposit Account 09-0457.

Date: 08/31/2006

Jack P. Friedman  
Jack P. Friedman  
Registration No. 44,688

Schmeiser, Olsen & Watts  
22 Century Hill Drive - Suite 302  
Latham, New York 12110  
(518) 220-1850